

BATTEY et al.  
10/774,266  
Page 2

### REMARKS

Pursuant to paragraph 1 of the above-referenced Office Action, Applicants' election of Group II having claims 1, 3, 5-23 and 27-29 readable thereon is acknowledged.

Pursuant to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner requires a new title "that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed." Independent claims 1, 11 and 27 are directed to "an optical connection closure" comprising "at least one connector port" (claims 1 and 11) or "a plurality of connector ports" (claim 27). Upon reading the specification it is immediately apparent that the most distinguishing factor of Applicants' invention is the addition of a connector port in an external wall of an optical connection closure for receiving a pre-connectorized fiber optic cable (e.g., drop cable). Since the current title of the application is "Optical Connection Closure Having At least One Connector Port," Applicants are at a loss to conceive of a descriptive title that is *more* clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicants are unable to comply with the requirement to provide a more descriptive title. In the event the Examiner suggests a replacement title that meets the above criteria, Applicants agree to amend the title of the application.

Pursuant to paragraphs 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 7-18, 20-23, and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0150371 A1 published on October 17, 2002, which issued as US Patent No. 6,798,947 on September 28, 2004 (Battey et al.). The Examiner asserts that Battey et al. "shows an optical connection closure 10 having a base 12 and a cover 37 defining an interior cavity, a plurality of openings 18 on an end wall 16 for receiving a portion of distribution cable 80 and a plurality of connector ports 20 within the external (end) wall 16 for receiving a plurality of optical fibers 90 of the distribution cable and pre-connectorized optical fiber drop cables 88 on the outside of the closure. ... The drop cable can be connected, disconnected or reconfigured without entering the closure." See Office Action at pages 2-3.

BATTEY et al.  
10/774,266  
Page 3

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to the rejected claims. In particular, independent claims 1, 11 and 27 recite an optical connection closure comprising *inter alia* at least one connector port located within an external wall (e.g., end wall) of the closure for receiving a pre-connectorized fiber optic drop cable on the outside of the closure. In contrast, Battey et al. discloses an interconnection closure 10 comprising ports defined by end caps 16 that receive a fiber optic feeder cable extending through the splice closure and the end portions of one or more fiber optic drop cables.

While the end caps may define a number of different types of ports, the end caps of the illustrated embodiment include conical-shaped ports 18 for receiving and securely engaging a fiber optic feeder cable, an electrical feeder cable, and the like, and a seam 20 defined by a plurality of opposed, flexible fingers through which one or more drop cables extend. As such, in a fiber-to-the-home, fiber-to-the-business, or fiber-to-the-desk application, *one or more of the optical fibers of a fiber optic feeder cable can be spliced to respective optical fibers of the fiber optic drop cables within the closure, while the remaining optical fibers of the fiber optic feeder cable can extend uninterrupted through the closure.*

Battey et al. at paragraph 28 (emphasis added).

Clearly, the closure described and shown in Battey et al. does not comprise at least one connector port located within an external wall of the closure. The "ports" 18 receive a fiber optic feeder cable or an electrical feeder cable. One or more drop cables *extend through* the seam 20 defined by opposed flexible fingers. Finally, one or more optical fibers of the feeder cable are *spliced* to respective optical fibers of the drop cables *within* the closure. Battey et al. does not disclose or arguably suggest that the closure is provide with connector ports in an external wall and that the drop cables are pre-connectorized for interconnection with optical fibers of the feeder (i.e., distribution) cable through the connector ports located in the external wall. Specifically, in Battey et al., the drop cables extend through the seam 20 defined by the opposing fingers on the end wall of the closure and the optical fibers of the drop cables are spliced to optical fibers of the feeder (i.e., distribution) cable inside the closure. Battey et al. does not envision or include provision (e.g., connector ports) for receiving a pre-connectorized drop cable on the outside of the closure OR a connectorized optical fiber on the inside of the closure.

BATTEY et al.  
10/774,266  
Page 4

As such, Battey et al. does not anticipate the invention of independent claims 1, 11 and 27. Claims 3, 5 and 7-10 depend directly from patentable base claim 1, and thus are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 12-18 and 20-23 depend directly or indirectly from patentable base claim 11, and thus are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 28 depends directly from patentable base claim 27, and thus is likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7-18, 20-23 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Pursuant to paragraphs 5-6 of the Office Action, claims 6, 19 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable (i.e., obvious) over Battey et al. The Examiner asserts that Battey et al. "shows all the features of [the rejected] claims except a connector adapter sleeve disposed in the connector port and base and cover to be breathable and pressurized." However, the Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the closure of Battey et al. with adapter sleeve means to align and support the connector because such a feature is well known and widely used in the art of optical fiber connectors. Without comment as to the merits, Applicants traverse the rejection on the basis that the rejected claims 6, 19 and 29 depend directly or indirectly from the patentable base claims 1, 11 and 27, respectively, and thus, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is improper and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

As a result of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1, 3, 5-23 and 27-29 are patentable and respectfully request the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowability for the pending claims.

BATTEY et al.  
10/774,266  
Page 5

### CONCLUSION

This Amendment being timely submitted and fully responsive to the Office Action, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for immediate allowance. The Amendment does not result in more independent or total claims than paid for previously. Accordingly, no fee for excess claims is due. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any other fee due in connection with the filing of this response to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. If an extension of time not already accounted for is required with this response, Applicants hereby petition for such extension of time and the Examiner is likewise authorized to charge the petition fee to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. Any overpayment should be credited to Deposit Account No. 19-2167.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher C. Dreman  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,504  
P.O. Box 489  
Hickory, NC 28603  
Telephone: 828/901-5904  
Facsimile: 828/901-5206

Dated: June 27, 2005